

## **REMARKS**

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-7, 16, 18 and 21-31 will remain pending in this application. Applicants submit that no new matter is added by the present amendment.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1-7, 16, 18 and 21-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,795,071 (“Tracey”) in view of the Hiramatsu paper. Applicants respectfully traverse.

### ***Interview Summary***

Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiners Jeffrey Gaffin and Mark Radtke participated in a telephonic interview on August 14, 2007 to discuss the independent claims in relation the cited references. During the interview, Mr. Eiferman presented the remarks below. Agreement was reached, and Examiners Gaffin and Radtke agreed that these remarks appeared to distinguish the independent claims from the cited references so as to overcome the standing 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claim 18 is hereby amended to correct its dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection is respectfully requested.

### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1-7, 16, 18 and 21-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,795,071 (“Tracey”) in view of the Hiramatsu paper. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 1, 16 and 25 recite a plurality of related service entities each corresponding to a different business process. The related service entities are matched based on corresponding service metadata and are then combined into a context entity. The service metadata for the service entities is also combined into context metadata. An application

entity is then matched to the context entity based on application metadata and the context metadata.

After the application entity is matched to the context entity, the application determines a state of each service entity within its corresponding different business process. The application also determines dynamic actions available on each service entity within its corresponding different business process. The available dynamic actions include an indication of whether a state change is available on each service entity within its corresponding different business process. The application then generates a display of the state of each service entity within its corresponding different business process and the available dynamic actions.

As noted in the Office Action, Tracey discloses only a *single* business process. Accordingly, Tracey cannot possibly teach or suggest a plurality of service entities corresponding to different business processes, and the *matching* and *combining* of the related service entities into a context entity.

The Office Action cites Hiramatsu as teaching a plurality of business processes. However, like Tracey, Hiramatsu also fails to teach or suggest the *matching* and *combining* of the related service entities into a context entity.

Accordingly, the cited references do not teach or suggest at least the following features of independent claims 1 and 25 (or similar features from independent claim 16):

- matching the related service entities based on the service metadata;
- combining the related service entities into a context entity that is a single entity derived from one or more service entities;
- combining service metadata corresponding to the context entity into context metadata;

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 16 and 25 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants further submit that claims 2-7, 18, 21-24 and 26-31 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections are respectfully requested.

**DOCKET NO.:** 301410.01 / MSFT-1948  
**Application No.:** 10/648,507  
**Office Action Dated:** July 20, 2007

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: September 20, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/  
Kenneth R. Eiferman  
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439